

Remarks

1. Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action mailed June 27, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 10-13, and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,475,735 (Williams et al.), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0164993 (Elliot) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0060215 (Graham). Further, the Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Williams et al., Elliot, Graham, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0037729 (Dupont et al.). Further still, the Examiner rejected claims 4-5, 9, 14-15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Williams et al., Elliot, Graham, and U.S. Patent No. 5,450,613 (Takahara et al.), and the Examiner rejected claims 6, 16, 18, and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Williams et al., Elliot, Graham, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0038664 (Stoks).

2. Amendments and Pending Claims

Applicant has amended claims 1, 10-11, and 22, and added new claims 25-27. Claims 1-6, 9-18, and 21-27 are presently pending in this application. Claims 1, 10-11, and 22 are independent.

3. Payment of Fees

A fee of \$50.00 is required for an additional new claim. Please charge this fee and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.21 or credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 210765.

4. Response to the Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 10-13, and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Williams et al., Elliot, and Graham. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10-11, and 22. Claims 1, 10-11, and 22, as amended, clearly distinguish over the combination of Williams et al., Elliot, and Graham, because the combination of Williams et al., Elliot, and Graham fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of any of these claims.

In particular, the combination of Williams et al., Elliot, and Graham fails to disclose or suggest at least the elements of: (i) comparing a registered location of a fixed wireless device (or wireless local loop hub) to a current location of the fixed wireless device (or wireless local loop hub), *wherein the registered location comprises stored information indicating a customer premises where the fixed wireless device (or wireless local loop hub) is located*, as recited in claims 1 and 10, or (ii) data storage for storing a registered location of a fixed wireless device (or wireless local loop hub), *wherein the registered location comprises stored information indicating a customer premises where the fixed wireless device (or wireless local loop hub) is located*, as recited in claims 11 and 22.

In rejecting claims 1, 10-11, and 22, the Examiner indicated Williams et al. is silent on comparing a registered location of a fixed wireless device to a current location of the fixed wireless device. Instead, the Examiner relied on Elliot for teaching this element, as well as for teaching data storage for storing a registered location of a fixed wireless device (or wireless local loop hub). However, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10-11, and 22 so as to clarify that *the registered location comprises stored information indicating a customer premises where the fixed wireless device (or wireless local loop hub) is located*. The

combination of Williams et al., Elliot, and Graham does not teach or suggest the elements containing this limitation.

Rather, at best, the combination of Williams et al., Elliot, and Graham teaches: (i) a wireless fixed access unit (WFAU) is a personal communications system (PCS) customer radiophone packaged for permanent mounting in or on customer premises at a fixed location, (ii) determining whether the location of a mobile device matches a previously stored path plan or whether the mobile device has traveled to a restricted location or out of a specific geographic region, and (iii) as a mobile station (MS) moves from one cell to another, the cellular telephone system updates a record of the MS's current cell location. (See, e.g., Williams et al., col. 9, lines 3-6, Elliot, paragraphs 29 and 31, and Graham, paragraph 4).

Applicant submits that teaching a previously stored path plan, restricted location, and specific geographic region does not teach or suggest a registered location since the previously stored path plan, restricted location, and specific geographic region do not amount to a registered location, *wherein the registered location comprises stored information indicating a customer premises where the fixed wireless device (or wireless local loop hub) is located.*

Applicant submits that claims 1, 10-11, and 22 are allowable because the combination of Williams et al., Elliot, and Graham fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1, 10-11, and 22. Further, without conceding the assertions made by the Examiner regarding dependent claims 2-6, 9, 12-18, 21, and 23-24, Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-6, 9, 12-18, 21, and 23-24 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from one of allowable claims 1 or 11. Further still, Applicant submits that new claims 25-27 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from one of allowable claims 1, 11, or 22.

5. Conclusion

Applicant believes that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this response. However, failure to address a specific rejection or assertion made by the Examiner does not signify that Applicant agrees with or concedes that rejection or assertion.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-6, 9-18, and 21-27 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

**MCDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Date: August 30, 2006

By: David L. Ciesielski
David L. Ciesielski
Reg. No. 57,432